

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2008 – 7:00 PM
CATA CONFERENCE ROOM
3 POND ROAD
ROBERT GULLA, CHAIRMAN**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Robert Gulla, Chairman
Arthur Socolow
John Feener
Brandon Frontiero

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ann Jo Jackson, Vice Chair
William Febiger

STAFF PRESENT

Nancy Ryder, Conservation Agent
Carol Gray, Recording Clerk

Mr. Robert Gulla, Chairman opens the meeting of the Gloucester Conservation Commission.

87 WINGAERSHEEK ROAD – The Agent reviews with the GCC stating that was tentatively approved at a previous meeting with more information to be submitted. Helix Anchor information, reports from the Building Inspector, the construction sequence, info. re: the use of the Bobcat, mitigation planting plan and details re: the pilings. The MSDS sheet came back with no determination.

Mr. Bill Sanborn, Building Inspector questioned the appropriateness of the helix anchors for this project and requests' holding off until the structural design is reviewed. Sonotubes were noted as well as the withstanding winds of 100 mph.

Mr. Gulla notes that the mitigation plan as of yet has not been submitted and states that he will entertain a motion to continue to the next meeting. The applicant needs to submit the mitigation plan.

MOTION: Mr. Socolow moves to continue the matter to 07/02/08 7:05 PM

SECOND: Mr. Frontiero **VOTE:** 4-0 all in favor.

218 ATLANTIC STREET – The Agent reviews with the GCC stating that this was tentatively approved at a previous meeting. DEP stated that they could not determine if this met the Performance Standards for work in a dune.

Mr. Gulla states that he feels the GCC can allow this to go forward as it is a specific situation at a specific site and feels a reasonable solution was worked out. He didn't think that it would go against anything the GCC would determine in the future.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to approve the remediation of the restoration decision for a violation and release of the issuance of a violation.

MOTION: Mr. Feener

SECOND: Mr. Frontiero **VOTE:** 4-0 all in favor.

116 WHEELER STREET – The Agent reviews with the GCC and states that one signature was needed to finalize this matter. Mr. Socolow and Mr. Frontiero sign the document provided by the Agent.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - none/closed.

LETTER PERMITS

A brief discussion was had with the Agent re: a motion to approve the resurfacing of roadways in Gloucester: Cherry Street, from Poplar Street to *****, Concord Street from the Causeway to Atlantic Ave., and East Main Street to Chapel Street.

MOTION: Mr. Feener moves to approve.

SECOND: Mr. Socolow VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

CHERRY STREET - The Agent reviews with the GCC stating this is a Letter Permit in regards to the installation of catch basins.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to approve the Letter Permit.

MOTION: Mr. Socolow moves to approve.

SECOND: Mr. Frontiero VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

63 GROVE STREET – The Agent reviews with the GCC stating that this is in re: the installation of three drive points and one seepage meter in regards to water and soil qualities.

The work is to be done by hand with the points hand pressed 6 ft. below grade.

Mr. Feener notes that a copy of the results should be sent to the Agent. This is not a stand alone project but relates to what they have already done.

Photos were reviewed by the GCC.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to approve, with monitoring.

MOTION: Mr. Frontiero moves to approve.

SECOND: Mr. Socolow VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

8-10 SANDY WAY (Map 257, Lots 217 & 218)

This is a Request for Determination submitted by Sandy Way Homeowners Assoc. to construct a seasonal boardwalk over the dune.

The Agent states that the applicant has requested a withdrawal.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to approve the withdrawal of the request of the Letter Permit.

MOTION: Mr. Socolow

SECOND: Mr. Frontiero VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

The Agent notes a letter was submitted filed as an RDA, DEP states that a Nol is required. They may file as a Nol at a later date.

136 WINGAERSHEEK ROAD (Map 260, Lot 16)

This is a Request for Determination submitted by James Cennerazzo to maintain a newly constructed septic system and to construct a dwelling with associated utilities.

The Agent states a report from Mr. Peter Rosen was emailed to each member.

Mr. Rosen, Coastal Geologist is present and before the GCC with the applicant, Mr. Cennerazzo.

He states that the area was cleared and the GCC thought it to be dune.

Hancock Assoc. had asked for a continuation until this evening.

He notes questions to be answered as well as the Wetland Act.

It connects all the way down to the beach so it is a dune. He notes it at elevation 37.

He notes no flood control issues and any habitat issues were noted in the previous RDA.

He notes a finding of non-significance and states you have jurisdiction but no interests to be regulated. He notes an example re: Nantucket.

Mr. Socolow inquires as to construction and excavation and Mr. Rosen states that the matter does involve excavation.

The Agent notes that the summary and review is exactly what the GCC had asked for.
Mr. Cennerazzo states that the vegetation is so tight the Board of Health couldn't dig anything.
Mr. Rosen notes it as being dense upland vegetation.
Mr. Socolow inquires if this is not dune vegetation then what is it?
Mr. Cennerazzo submits photos with Mr. Gulla stating that the GCC does not normally accept photos the night of meeting but since the GCC made the request they will review them.
Mr. Gulla inquires as to the removal of the vegetation in re: any destabilization or impede any dune migration.
Mr. Rosen states that there was no movement of sand with several sides of it being developed already as well a roadway.
The Agent notes a small isolated dune area between a house and a roadway.
Mr. Rosen states that dune grass would grow but would not flourish. He suggests bayberry and rosa rugosa. Mr. Feener suggests juniper.
The Agent states that she is in agreement with Mr. Rosen's findings.
Mr. Gulla states that a mitigation plan is needed and is to be submitted to the Agent before any further work is done.
Mr. Socolow inquires as to the submittal of the construction plans and foundation information with the Agent stated yes to both inquiries.
Mr. Cennerazzo states that the leaching field will be a mound and will need basement level with the mound. There will be a 4 ft. frost wall digging in 2 to 3 ft.
Mr. Socolow inquires as to where the excavated material will go with Mr. Rosen stating that it will stay on site and there will be no silt.

PUBLIC COMMENT: none/closed.

Mr. Gulla states that it is within jurisdiction but does not impact the resource area.
The Agent states that the delineation was done by Hancock Assoc. and it is not correct as they claim it is not coastal dune.
The mitigation plan is to be submitted.
Mr. Cennerazzo inquires as to any planting to be done on the leaching field with Mr. Gulla stating that Mr. Rosen can assist him with that.
Mr. Gulla entertains a motion for a negative determination +2B/+5/-3.

MOTION: Mr. Feener moves for the neg. determination

SECOND: Mr. Frontiero VOTE: 3-0 ABSTENTION: 1

WEST GLOUCESTER WATER FILTRATION PLANT – MAGNOLIA AVENUE

(Map 213, Lot 16)

This is a Request for Determination submitted by MA Dept. of Fish and Game to conduct test pit activity.

Mr. Dave Sargent, Shellfish Constable for the City of Gloucester present along with Ms. Kathy Lahey, MA Audubon Society.

Mr. Sargent states that hopefully they can remove sludge and the fish ladder. They need to locate the water line noting a map. He notes the existing site plan re: the fish ladder and sludge lagoon.

He further notes the concrete retaining wall. They would like to take 3 test holes and may need to dewater. They will use an access that has already been disturbed. Silt fencing will be on site with equipment on site as well.

Mr. Socolow inquired as to test pits being done over a pipe.

Mr. Sargent states that it is 6 to 8 ft. with a back hoe being used and hand dug when the West Gloucester Plant is not online.

Mr. Socolow inquired as to the material coming out of the pits with Mr. Sargent stating it would be beside and backfilled.

Mr. Gulla inquired as to what exactly what they are looking for with Mr. Sargent stating they are looking for the exact elevation of the water pipe.

Mr. Sargent states that he saw small alewife schools in the hundreds from the pond out.

Ms. Lahey states that it was the best count in years with 50 to 60 fish being seen.

Mr. Sargent states this would be a Certified DEP soil evaluation and a one day job, correcting that to possibly ½ a day job. If it rains on the scheduled day, it will be cancelled.

Mr. Gulla notes that they need to tread carefully and all environmental issues protected.

PUBLIC COMMENT: none/closed.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to approve a negative determination.

MOTION: Mr. Socolow moves to approve the neg. det.

SECOND: Mr. Frontiero

VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

377 MAGNOLIA AVE (Map 213, Lot 27)

This is a Request for Determination submitted by Elizabeth Jewell to maintain a newly paved parking area and driveway in a riverfront resource area.

Ms. Elizabeth Jewell is present and states that the work is completed and is requesting a Certificate of Compliance. She didn't realize that she could not pave the driveway.

The Agent states that the property is within riverfront resource and the plan did not show a driveway. The mitigation of 2 to 1 was for the structure not for the driveway.

Mr. Gulla states that being near the river it is important that the water filters through the soils and impervious surfaces hamper that. He notes this being a very sensitive area.

Three options were noted: Removal of the paved area, mitigation or partial removal of the paved area.

Ms. Jewell notes that asphalt being at 2 to 2 ½ inches. There was no clearing or excavation done to put in the driveway. She states she was unaware that the paved driveway needed to be addressed.

The Agent states that she is not opposed to the driveway but mitigation needs to be done.

Mr. Socolow inquires as to a perforated pervious area with Mr. Gulla stating that Jason can assist with that.

Mr. Gulla explains to the applicant what would have occurred had she come before the GCC re: the driveway. She needs to figure out the 10% rule in relation to her property re: amount of impervious area. You need to determine if you have 10% lot coverage. The applicant may have to remove some asphalt along with mitigation.

Mr. Socolow notes that if the figure is more than 10% one solution may be to remove part of the driveway. Mr. Feener notes possibly removing some impervious on the property.

Mr. Gulla states that if go with removal, they could remove the area that least impacts the property and what they have already done.

He further states that the GCC have standards that they to adhere to.

The Agent notes that there is to be no sand or salt and to please call if that ever is the case and she will contact the appropriate parties.

PUBLIC COMMENT: none/closed.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to continue the matter to 07/16/08 8PM.

MOTION: Mr. Socolow

SECOND: Mr. Feener

VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

13 SALT ISLAND ROAD (Map176, Lot 54)

This is a Request for Determination submitted by Cyril Means to maintain and complete stair reconstruction in coastal bank.

Ms. Annette Means, sister of the applicant is present and before the GCC.

The Agent notes that there is a lot going on at the site and some of it was Letter Permitted.

The walkway is on coastal bank. She notes the rocks on the beach and states that the stairs existed in the past.

Photos were reviewed by the GCC.

The Agent notes that if the repair is done in the same area, it is not an issue.

The work needs to be done by hand.

Mr. Gulla inquired as to revising the existing pads and the applicant stated; yes the granite is fine and has been there for about 100 yrs.

Mr. Gulla states that he feels he is ok with the project if the work is done by hand and the existing foundation is going to be utilized.

He further inquired as to the construction sequence and the materials to be used.

Ms. Means states that stones are to be used, done by hand.

The Agent states that some vegetation was cleared with no roots being disturbed and it has all grown back.

Mr. Feener states that any further removal the Agent needs to be notified.

The Agent states that they will in fact need to come back as it is a secondary coastal bank

She further notes the existing walls that were repaired previously.

Mr. Gulla inquires as to cement and the applicant stated yes. He states that all cement mixing is to be done upland.

PUBLIC COMMENT: none/closed.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion for a negative determination +2B/5/-3.

MOTION: Mr. Socolow

SECOND: Mr. Frontiero VOTE: 4-0 all in favor

Noted comments: Construction details need to be submitted along with a pre start of work conference with the contractor and the Agent, Ms. Nancy Ryder.

Mr. Feener reminds the applicant that before any cutting they need to come before the GCC.

142 HESPERUS AVENUE (Map 190, Lot 43)

This is a Request for Determination submitted by Barry and Ellen Gradwhol to determine the applicability of the Wetlands Protection Act and the local Wetlands Ordinance to construct an enclosed porch on sonotubes at the resource area to a stream.

Mr. Gulla would have to recuse himself should the matter go forward this evening.

MOTION: Mr. Feener moves to continue the matter to 07/02/08 8 PM

SECOND: Mr. Socolow VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion for a 5 minute recess.

MOTION: Mr. Feener moves to approve

SECOND: Mr. Socolow VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

Meeting Resumes

39 WINGAERSHEEK ROAD – Enforcement Order

Signing in regarding this issue:

Mr. Dan Ottenheimer; Mill River Consulting

Mr. Sal Frontiero, Frontiero Law Office

Ms. Mary Rimmer; Rimmer Environmental Consulting

Mr. James DeSouza Ward, Homeowner

Ms. Anne DeSouza Ward, Homeowner

Mr. Gulla states that during a site visit he noticed a lack of sensitivity when it came to the resource area as well as things that were not on the plan.

Mr. Sal Frontiero, Esq. addresses the GCC noting three phases of the plan - mitigation, construction compliance, and a site professional overseeing the plan.

Mr. Ottenheimer, Mill River Consulting notes confusion as to what was on the plan and what was done. He is not contesting the fact that the dune grass was disturbed. He feels there is a fair balance between existing, what was damaged and the planting where vegetation had not existed before.

Ms. Mary Rimmer notes the dune grass. She notes 2700 sq. ft as un-vegetated with this being 19% of the lot. She notes the planting of dune grass in the winter during its dormant stage noting stem sensitivity and spacing in the mitigation plan with fencing to be used.

Monitoring of two growing seasons is planned.

Mr. Ottenheimer notes that the area is quite significant and more than the area that was disturbed.

Mr. Gulla inquired as to any comments from DEP re: do over.

Ms. Nancy Ryder, Conservation Agent for the GCC states that DEP recommends a complete tear down.

Mr. Gulla notes that they need to look at putting back. He notes that the GCC worked with the applicant's representative so that decisions can be consistent re: coastal dunes.

He asked how can they get to these issues without going back.

The Agent states that the whole point is the not taking down of the walls.

Mr. Ottenheimer states that the language is ambiguous re: what is a foundation as opposed to a 1st floor.

The Agent reads the previous Gloucester Conservation Commission rulings regarding what is to be and not be. The application was filed, and she notes that it states, the top of the 1st floor shall remain with no removal of the foundation walls. There is no allowance and no tolerance for the removal and disturbance.

Mr. Gulla states that the GCC was clear about their concerns and intent. He notes that this is a very sensitive area. It was noted that DEP said to take it down and put it on piers.

Mr. Ottenheimer states that Mr. Gulla's statement is incorrect.

The Agent states that it was part of the original filing.

*Mr. Ottenheimer reviews the intent of the project using a photograph to describe what was done and what was not done. He notes what he feels is the footprint, the foundation, the work that was done on the first floor and notes the locations of the door and the windows.

He notes that this was to be renovated with the foundation to remain. He notes the photo and the 1st and 2nd floor stating the first is not a foundation that the foundation is beneath that. He further states in re: DEP comments - a complete teardown needs to be on pilings and this is not a complete teardown. He notes a FEMA policy that does not apply to this project. He noted discussion and confusion regarding this at the 12/19 GCC meeting and that photos dated 01/09/08 adds additional confusion. He notes a notation was made on the photos at the meeting, the same day as the vote. The minutes of 1/19/08 state that it is to be taken down to the foundation and there is a misunderstanding as to the intent and what has unfolded. In the record the GCC states that if there is a removal of the foundation then it needs to be on pilings

and he does not feel this was a complete teardown and rebuild. He notes the photos and alterations done to the 1st floor and states that he feels the OoC states no alteration to the foundation and feels the 1st floor is in tact.

Mr. Gulla states that no one here this evening was initially involved but we were clear at the time and he feels there may be a misinterpretation as the GCC was clear re: the foundation. After 50% you start to get into the criteria of a teardown.

The Agent states that for purposes of this hearing the entire area is considered 1st floor.

Mr. Gulla states that the foundation is to remain the same and that the footprint remains in tact.

Mr. Frontiero discusses the issue in relation to a poured foundation.

Mr. Gulla states the representatives of the property owner that their concept of the foundation was not disturbed but the GCC assumed it was a whole unit. An erroneous piece of information was submitted as to where the foundation began and ended.

We were specific and did not want the 1st floor touched.

The Agent states that it was defined as foundation and there was no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. Gulla states that the GCC was clear at the time that the walls were not to be disturbed. He notes his concern about manipulating concrete. The 1st floor level was to remain untouched in keeping with the standards. Now it has been done and we need to agree to disagree.

Mr. Ottenheimer states that changing a few windows and a door is not that significant and would like the GCC to take that into consideration.

Mr. Gulla notes his concern with opening up other grey areas. He notes that they can believe what they want but the GCC was clear re: what is foundation wall and what is not. He further noted a silt sock that was bound up on one side.

Mr. Frontiero feels the OoC's was breached. He further notes: a site supervisor, mitigation plan, detailed construction sequence and the compliance plan. There is a heavy burden on the contractor with harsh consequences should compliance not be met.

He notes a log book being on site, a trained subcontractor, onsite person taking responsibility of a daily checklist, the 3rd party needs to read and sign the OoC information, signage and a log book on site noting daily compliance. He states that the plan is detailed and strict.

Mr. Feener notes a letter dated 06/10/08 re: less than 50% re: opening in the walls and the Agent questions the numbers.

Mr. Gulla states that fines have been discussed.

Mr. Ottenheimer states that someone can be on site once a week and will submit monthly reports.

The Agent states that the GCC requires weekly reports.

Mr. Gulla inquired as to planting with Ms. Rimmer stating she has not been contracted to do so as of yet.

Mr. Ottenheimer states that the property will be monitored for two growing seasons.

The Agent states that the OoC has not been met and she recommends that the 1st floor be cut out or the house lifted and on pilings. The GCC should have formal findings and vote.

Ms. Rimmer notes the Performance Standards of the Wetland Protection Act and states that there is not a lot of guidance re: coastal dune or re: teardown construction or re-construction.

The standards have not been changed since the 1980's. She feels there is not a lot to go on re: the Performance Standards. The footprint of the construction has not changed even with the noted windows. From what was approved to what is now cannot be resolved/proven either way using the Performance Standards.

The Agent states that the issue is in violation. She notes DEP in re: Performance Standards and coastal dune.

The Agent states that this foundation has been altered, is in violation of the OoC and the GCC statement of reason. The GCC considers removal of the walls new construction.

New construction is to be on piers. She also notes mitigation being in place.

Mr. Frontiero states that the GCC was clear regarding what was foundation. He notes the OoC and the 1st floor walls stating that it was considered foundation and was agreed upon between the contractor and the applicant. It was already previously agreed upon.

Mr. Socolow states that he was not here at the initial meeting but if the walls on the 1st floor were concrete block, I would've considered it to be foundation. Holes cut into block walls represent alteration of the foundation.

Mr. Feener notes that at this point in time he does not know if it is new construction or not.

Mr. James Ward, property owner apologizes to the GCC re: the contractor. He states that he thought they were within the footprint and height requirements and he didn't think they were doing anything wrong. He is surprised that this is such an issue and apologizes.

Mr. Gulla states that the GCC can only look at what we approve and what was done.

PUBLIC COMMENT: none/closed.

Mr. Gulla states that he agrees with Mr. Frontiero re: what the GCC asked for and what we wanted was made clear at the time and now things have changed. If we don't make it clear (like we thought we did), we will have issues in the future re: what is foundation and what is not.

The Agent notes that the mitigation is for other violations.

Mr. Ottenheimer notes the property at 57 Wingaersheek Rd. stating that they clearly did not comply and 39 Wingaersheek is a different type of project. He notes a previous GCC issue re: where concrete was to be poured, stating that was not made clear and the document the GCC issued was not made clear.

The Agent states that the violation was not from anything to do with the footprint.

The Agent notes the conditions and states that there should be no doubt as it is all quite clear and notes as shown in the photos and not on the plan.

Mr. Gulla states that no one has given the GCC anything re: mitigation from the additional cutting that was done and not giving anyone any direction had a bad result.

Mr. Sal Frontiero states that the effects could be worse by cutting the foundation.

Mr. Gulla states that mitigation could be opening up the basement and allowing for migration of the dune.

Mr. Socolow inquires as DEP comments and/or rulings and Mr. Gulla states that it was left up to the GCC to make the determination.

Mr. Gulla inquires with the GCC as to voting or continuing the matter.

Mr. Ottenheimer inquires as to a possible site visit.

The applicant was asked for measurements re: the height of the slab floor and bottom of the 2nd floor to which he replied 7 ½ ft. His line of thought is if there is enough height, to which there isn't, a new 1st floor. Although maybe ambiguous in writing we thought it was clear to the applicants. He recommends the GCC schedule a site visit.

The applicant states that there are enormous consequences to this issue involving hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The Agent notes the photos and the documents are based on submitted photos of 12/17/07 with clarification at the meeting and notes on the photos with documents signed.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to continue to 07/02/08 8:30 PM.

MOTION: Mr. B. Frontiero moves to continue the matter to the above date and time.

SECOND: Mr. Socolow VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

*(Information from the tape may be needed here to complete the review of the intent of the project expressed by Mr. Ottenheimer at the beginning of the discussion of this matter.)

57 ADAMS HILL ROAD (Map 120, Lot 13)

This is a Notice of Intent submitted by Matthew Wolfe, Carpenter & MacNeille Inc. to install a seasonal ramp and float on a coastal bank.

Mr. Matthew Wolfe and Mr. John Dick present and before the GCC.

Mr. Dick submits green cards to the Agent.

Mr. Dick states that this is for a small dock on piers to be fixed to the existing coastal bank at the ledge and fastened by pinnings.

He notes an Eel Grass Survey and two areas on the plan where DEP says eel grass is located.

He notes a line: rupia.

This is under review with DEP file no. 1951.

Mr. Socolow inquired as to what a seasonal ramp is with Mr. Dick stating that the ramp would be removed as well.

The Agent states that she had a site visit with Dave and Jim.

Jim and Dave would like to go out to the site with site plan in hand at low tide.

She states that the plan represents a great deal of what the site visit covered.

She notes that Dave Sargent will probably require some type of eel grass survey with 5 years of monitoring.

The applicant states that the ramp is not proposed to rest in the eelgrass.

The Agent states that it is more for the boat traffic in that particular area.

Mr. Socolow inquired as to standoffs and Mr. Dick stated that standoffs are proposed (24 inches).

Mr. Dick states that there will be wet storage, meaning it will be stored at Lobster Cove and moored there.

The Agent states that if it grounds out it will be in violation.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to continue the matter to 07/02/08 7:05 PM.

MOTION: Mr. Feener moves to continue the matter to the above date and time.

SECOND: Mr. Socolow VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

127 ROGERS STREET (Map 11, Lot 6)

This is a Request for Determination submitted by Gorton's Inc. to repair the pile supported structure beneath the existing buildings including rehabilitation of a damaged slab foundation and timber retaining wall.

Mr. Pera and Mr. Gazda present and before the GCC.

Mr. Pena reviews the plan with the GCC. He notes a recommendation dated 4/16 and a site visit done on 5/8 with Jim, Dave and Ms. Ryder.

He notes a 75 ft. section of the retaining wall on the plan and a section of the interior building at 22 ft. The delineation of the work zone area is shown on the plan.

The Agent states that the underneath of the building has collapsed. The Agent notes she has no issues with this along with Jim and Dave who are in agreement.

The work needs to be done as the building is collapsing.

Mr. Gazda explains the grout bags to the GCC stating that they solidify in about two days. There are perforations in the grout bags to allow for the no. 8 bars. Mr. Pera notes that there is no access for machinery.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion for a negative determination, 2A/-5/-3.

MOTION: Mr. Socolow moves for a neg. det.

SECOND: Mr. Feener VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

161 THATCHER ROAD (Map 178, Lot no. not given)

This is a Notice of Intent submitted by Charles Pratt Jr. to construct a single family home with associated grading and utilities in a buffer zone to a marsh.

A request of continuation to 08/06/08.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to continue.

MOTION: Mr. Socolow moves to continue the matter to 08/06/08 7:30 PM

SECOND: Mr. Feener VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

370 MAGNOLIA AVENUE

Letter Permit request – This is in relation to a shed on blocks.

Photos were reviewed by the GCC

Mr. Gulla states that the applicant should come before the GCC.

This matter is pending.

3 PARKER STREET

Letter Permit request – installation of 2 fences – the fences divide a parking area and the floats along the harbor. Floats are in violation.

This matter is pending.

7 RACKLIFFE STREET

Letter Permit request – Remove and replace siding.

Photos were reviewed by the GCC.

This matter is pending.

WYOMA ROAD – Guy's Way to replace bricks in walkway.

The Agent notes that all work is to be done by hand. This is on coastal bank and dune but meets criteria.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to allow the LP

MOTION: Mr. Socolow

SECOND: Mr. Feener VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

2 GLOUCESTER AVENUE –

The Agent notes the conditions.

The barge came in, grounded out.

The pilings were cut and sleeves were used, the property owner said he was going to use and preserve. This is under a stop work order now.

The Agent notes a Shellfish mitigation program. The owner was allowed to leave the sleeves.

Mr. Gulla entertains a motion to continue lifting the stop work order with conditions.

MOTION: Mr. Feener moves to continue the matter to 07/02/08 7:05 PM

SECOND: Mr. Socolow VOTE: 4-0 all in favor.

Certificates of Compliance

30 Rowley Shore Road - not in compliance - Denied

228 Atlantic Road – not in compliance - Denied

Correspondence and other Commission Business was briefly discussed.

Review of Minutes – continued to the next scheduled meeting of the GCC.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Gray
Recording Clerk